



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/534,658

10/14/2005

Bernd Schonebeck

7103.00US

7100

24739

7590

11/12/2009

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC
3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D
WATSONVILLE, CA 95076

EXAMINER

SHAH, PARAS D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/12/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

officeactions@CENTRALCOASTPATENT.COM
plambuth@centralcoastpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/534,658	Applicant(s) SCHONEBECK, BERND	
	Examiner PARAS SHAH	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26, 28-38, 40-69 and 70-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26, 28-38, 40-54, 56, 70-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 55 and 57-69 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Amendments and Arguments filed on 0729/2009. Claims 23-26, 28-38, and 40-73 are pending and have been examined, with claims 41-73 being newly added. The Applicants' amendment and remarks have been carefully considered, but they do not place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this Action has been made FINAL.

2. All previous objections and rejections directed to the Applicant's disclosure and claims not discussed in this Office Action have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments (pages 14-21) filed on 07-29/2009 with regard to claims 23-26, 28-38, and 40-46 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds for rejection.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicants' amendments filed on 11/19/2008 have been fully considered. The newly amended limitations in claims 41-73 necessitate new grounds of rejection.

With respect to the 35 USC 112, 1st rejections of claim 35, the Applicants amended the Specification to overcome the rejection. The Applicant's amendment of the Specification provides further evidence that the rejection contains new matter, which was not disclosed at the time of filing of the application. The Applicants were requested

to show support for such amendment. However, no support was provided. Hence, the rejection is maintained.

With respect to claims 23 and 35, the Applicant argues that the Roushar reference fails to teach the determination of an actual meaning of verbal input and generation of meaning statements. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion. The Applicant provides a section of the specification emphasizing certain aspects of the invention. However, the Applicants are reminded that although claimed limitations are read in light of the Specification, such description from Specification are not read into the claims (*See In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)) and therefore the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive in this respect. In comparing the claims with respect to the current prior art of Roushar, the limitation of the determination of an actual meaning of verbal input and generation of meaning statements are taught. In col. 8, lines 39-51, Roushar describes that the invention is used to interpret meaning of input text, which is used to assist users in engaging in dialog which is further stated on col. 9, lines 1-5. Figure 10 further shows the understanding and interpretation of text which is used for further processing. This further processing yields the generation of meaning statements. In col. 39, lines 5-30, the generation of sentences based on all of the information it knows, sentences are generated. Hence, meaning statements are generated as a result of the interpretations of past knowledge. Hence, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Claims dependent upon the independent base claim are rejected for similar reasons as mentioned above.

Specification

5. The amendment filed 07/29/2009 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The processing modules execute from a computer-readable medium in the system, which, as well known in the art, refers to a storage medium implemented as a hardware device integrated within a computerized device wherein information stored on said medium is encoded in a form which can be read by a computer and interpreted by the machine's hardware and/or software. Built into CES are a feedback."

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 55 should be dependent upon claim 54, which introduces the conflict module. Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claim 70 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 55 should be dependent upon claim 63, which introduces the virtual realization. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation in claim 35 recites the limitation of “executing from a digital storage media in a computing appliance,” which was not disclosed in the original application as filed on 05/10/2005.
10. Claims 36-46 are rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33-38, 40, 42, 45, and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roushar (US 7,403,890).

As to claim 23, Roushar teaches a language-processing system comprising:

a computerized appliance (see col. 45, lines 64, knowledge appliance device) having user input and output interfaces (see col. 46, lines 35-67, various input and output interfaces)), one or more processors (See col. 46, lines 5-11, one or more processors), and a computer-readable medium for storing and executing program code accessible to the one or more processors (see col. 46, lines 20-35, various memory components described); and

operating code executed by the one or more processors from the computer-readable medium (see col. 19, lines 60-54, specialized software) for processing text and audio messages ;

wherein text and audio messages input (see col. 27, lines 44-49, input is from voice recognition (audio input) and keyboard) to the system are separated into words and phrases to be considered individually (see col. 27, lines 49-54, text stored in memory and objects from the sentences are stored temporarily and recognized), meaning is determined for individual ones of the words and phrases (see col. 36, lines 36-37, language analysis on object performed and see lines 66-67 and col. 37, lines 25-34, semantics of sentence components), resulting in statements of meaning(see col. 38, lines 38-40, cause and effect relationships), and the resulting meaning statements are linked (see col. 38, lines 38-40, cause and effect relationships), providing meaning for the message (see col. 39, lines 1-3 and lines 5-17, where the interpreter uses the results for further generation such as dialogue).

As to claims 24 and 36, Roushar teaches wherein logically false and meaningless input messages are identified by the nature of the linked-meaning statement (see col. 28, lines 6-10, fitness used after analyses (semantic) col. 28, lines 60-61 missing information and multiple interpretations questions are generated as a result of the input) (e.g. Missing information causes meaningless input and false input).

As to claims 25 and 37, Roushar teaches wherein ambiguous input messages are made clear by the nature of the linked-meaning statement (see col. 28, lines 60-62, clarifying questions are generated based on missing information or multiple interpretations)

As to claims 26 and 38, Roushar teaches further comprising a situation model updated as language is processed (see col. 39, lines 41-49, where the interpreters can learn).

As to claims 28 and 40, Roushar teaches wherein conflicts between the linked-meaning statement and the situation model are detected and reported to the user (see col. 5, lines 21-23, where the interpreter uses a knowledge base and col. 28, lines 60-col. 29, lines 3, where clarifying questions are presented to the user as stated in col. 28, lines 19-21).

As to claims 30 and 42, Roushar teaches wherein the system finds unlinkable meaning statements (see col. 28, lines 60-67 and col. 29, lines 1-3, missing or multiple interpretations cause unlinked statement until user inputs) and reports the unlinkable statements to an external entity (see col. 28, lines 19-21, user is presented questions).

As to claims 33 and 45, Roushar teaches wherein meaning are applied to user to measured values (see col. 27, lines 45-48, input received via various input devices and see col. 27, lines 64-col. 28, lines 5, where multiple analyses including semantic and context analysis is performed), and these meanings are applied to the situation model (see col. 39, lines 41-46, learning by the interpreter done via mining processes for changes to knowledge base).

As to claim 34 and 46, Roushar teaches further comprising an artificial language intelligence (ALI) module (see col. 36, lines 28, interpreter based on language model) having cognitive routines of various classes (see page 36, lines 38-col. 37, lines 11, various analysis types), including routines for extraction of meaning (see col. 36, lines 66, semantics)), context-bound modification (see col. 37, lines 5, pragmatics associated with changes in context), context-bound association (see col. 37, pragmatics includes taxonomical descriptions of objects in real world), and logical inferences (see col. col. 37, lines 5-11, pragmatics), the ALI module making the routines available to the extractor (see col. Figure 10, where in step 1001 input is received and processing performed utilizing the routines of the interpreted in 1008 knowledge network, 1007

Art Unit: 2626

morphology analysis, 1010 semantics analysis, 1011 syntax analysis, and 1012 context analysis), and other modules of the system (see Figure 10, and various modules interacting with each other).

As to claim 35, Roushar teaches a method, executing from a digital storage media (see col. 46, lines 20-35, various memory components described) in a computing appliance (see col. 45, lines 64, knowledge appliance device), for language processing, comprising the steps of:

(a) extracting individual words and phrases from a message input as either voice or text (see col. 27, lines 44-49, input is from voice recognition (audio input) and keyboard); and

(b) determining meaning for individual ones of the words and phrases, resulting in meaning statements phrases (see col. 36, lines 36-37, language analysis on object performed and see lines 66-67 and col. 37, lines 25-34, semantics of sentence components); and

(c) linking the extracted meanings into meaning statements (see col. 38, lines 38-40, cause and effect relationships),, providing a linked meaning statement (see col. 39, lines 1-3 and lines 5-17, where the interpreter uses the results for further generation such as dialogue).

As to claim 47, Roushar teaches a system for automatically recognizing and further processing meaning of linguistically provided information, comprising:

an extractor (see Figure 10, load text 1002 and col. 27, lines 49-53) which extracts a concept and a concept category from a knowledge base for each word contained in said linguistically provided information (see col. 27, lines 51-58, where objects fro text are extracted and matched with the object base), wherein each extracted concept corresponds to the isolated meaning of one of the words (see col. 6, lines 2-5 and col. 27, lines 51-58, where object base contains similar objects and see col. 15, lines 25-33, where the objects contain meaning);

a connector (see Figure 10, induce flow of potentials 1009) which connects the extracted concepts to obtain a reconstructed meaning of said linguistically provided information (e.g. This connects the extracted objects by using knowledge network 1008 and see col. 27, lines 29-66);
wherein:

an artificial language intelligence is provided which coordinates an information exchange between the connector and the knowledge base (see col. 27, lines 66-col. 28, lines 1, various processed performed such as semantic syntactic, morphological, and context analysis), and which contains a pool of cognitive routines (see col. 27, lines 66-col. 28, lines 1, semantic syntactic, morphological, and context analysis); the connector first transmits a request code to the artificial language intelligence, the request code containing at least information regarding the connector and the extracted concept categories to be processed (see Figure 10, output of 1009 and input into 1007, 1010, 1011, and

Art Unit: 2626

1012 and col. 27, lines 63-66, where once flow is induced multiple analysis performed);

the artificial language intelligence subsequently processes the request code (see Figure 10, analysis performed 1007, 1010, 1011, and 1012 and col. 27, lines 63-66), thereby selecting a cognitive connection routine from the pool of cognitive routines (see col. 27, lines 66-col. 28, lines 5, where all analysis are selected and morphology analysis is selected first), said cognitive connection routine determined by the combination of information contained in the request code (see col. 27, lines 54-67 analysis performed based on the objects determined), extracts information from the knowledge base in consideration of the extracted concept categories to be processed (see col. 38, lines 31-42, where the knowledge base is utilized during semantic analysis), and transmits the cognitive connection routine and the information extracted from the knowledge base to the connector (see Figure 10, fitness algorithm 1013 applied and see col. 28, lines 5-16); and

the connector connects the extracted concepts in consideration of said cognitive connection routine and said information extracted from the knowledge base (see col. 28, lines 5-16, aggregate activation potentials and see Figure 10, where interpretation is determined from the input in 1016).

As to claim 48, Roushar teaches comprising

a feedback module (see col. 28, lines 60-63, clarifying questions), wherein concepts for which no linking is accomplished are conveyed to the feedback module, which brings them to the attention of a user of the system (see col. 28, lines 60-63, clarifying questions for missing information).

As to claim 49, Roushar teaches comprising

comprising a feedback module (see Figure 10, where a clarification statement to user is created), wherein concepts which are contained in said information extracted from the knowledge base and which are added to the linguistically provided information by the connector, are conveyed to the feedback module which brings them to the attention of a user of the system (see col. 28, lines 17-23, response received from the user).

As to claim 50, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

the feedback module initiates a query after receiving said unlinkable or added concepts(see col. 28, lines 60-63, clarifying questions for missing information).

As to claim 51, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

the feedback module initiates a query after receiving said unlinkable or added concepts (see col. 28, lines 18-21, question posed to user).

As to claim 52, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

the linguistically provided information is evaluated as a meaningless statement if the quantity of unlinked concepts exceeds a predefined number (see col. 28, lines 13-20) input words and phrases have vectors associated representing potentials and if below a threshold (unlinked concepts) user is prompted).

As to claim 53, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

unfamiliar concepts are deposited via a learning module in the knowledge base (see col. 39, lines 41-49, where the learned information is added to a knowledge base).

As to claim 54, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

a meaningfully reconstructed meaning of said linguistically provided information is conveyed to a conflict module (see col. 40, lines 45-54, where the automated learning process looks at preceding interpretations and current context), wherein the conflict module compares the reconstructed meaning of said information with the current situation context contained in a situation module (see col. 40, lines 55-65, where the context match is performed with respect to the topic and the context structure from which it was extracted from), which is part of the knowledge base (see col. 41, lines 28-30, where the knowledge base parameters are updated in conjunction with the automated learning process), by

using an appropriate comparison routine (see col. 40, lines 55-65, matched with topic and context structure).

As to claim 56, Roushar teaches comprising wherein comprising

a feedback module (see col. 44, lines 36-67, where the speaker adjusts parameters when interpretation results are incorrect), wherein a valid reconstructed meaning of said linguistically provided information that can nevertheless not be realized on the basis of the current situation is recognized by the conflict module (see col. 42, lines 17-33 and col.44, lines 25, 32, confidence values assigned to each proposition and presents to speaker in col. 44, lines 33-40) and is transferred to the feedback module which brings it to the attention of a user of the system (see col. 44, lines 35-47, adjustment of parameters based on user input).

As to claim 71, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

the extractor reduces the linguistically provided information to basic forms (see col. 27, lines 49-52, where the input text is reduced to objects).

As to claim 72, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

comprising special slots for implementing user-specific expert knowledge (see col. 27, lines 50, text loaded as objects), wherein the meaning of a new linguistically provided information is first reconstructed (see col. 27, lines 49,

input of text), is then compared with the content of the existing knowledge base (see col. 27, lines 54-57, matched with objects in object base), and finally a relevance evaluation is derived by an intelligence module on basis of the expert knowledge in accordance with user-specific criteria (see col. 28, lines 13-19, where the vectors for each word and phrase of input is evaluated).

As to claim 73, Roushar teaches comprising wherein

extracted knowledge from the knowledge base is made available in a buffer (see col. 30, lines 13-15, where objects from temporary storage is taken) and is reduced to relevant parts by subroutine (see col. 30, lines 13-20. interpreter takes objects for matching to see if it is in memory for placement in a sequence context).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 29 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roushar in view of Howard *et al.* (US 2001/0041980).

As to claims 29 and 41, Roushar teaches wherein conflicts (see col. 5, lines 21-23, where the interpreter uses a knowledge base and col. 28, lines 60-col. 29, lines 3,

Art Unit: 2626

where clarifying questions are presented to the user as stated in col. 28, lines 19-21) are used to predict future or developing risk (see col. 28, lines 20-23, input used to achieve full understanding such as dialogue (see col. 39, lines 13-16)

However, Roushar does not specifically teach the system being used in control situations.

Howard *et al.* teaches the using semantic information for controlling situations (see [0010], information retrieval from a device, (see [0011], refrigerator).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the language processing as taught by Roushar using it in conjunction with controlling devices as taught by Howard for the purpose of presenting information to the user based on user input for information retrieval (see Howard [0010], [0011].

15. Claims 31 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roushar in view of Shimomura *et al.* (US 2001/0021909).

As to claims 31 and 43, Roushar teaches all of the limitations as in claim 23 and 35, above.

Furthermore, Roushar teaches the use of the system in dialog (see col. 39, lines 17, dialogue) and further comprising a virtual realizer (see col. 36, lines 26-27, interpreter) recognizing meaning of the linked-meaning statements (see

col. 36, lines 36-37, analysis of language object for paraphrasing, translations, questions or dialogue (see col. 39, lines 13-17) used by the system.

However, Roushar does not specifically teach the system adapted for control of technical systems, including robotic systems, used by the system for generating commands for the technical systems.

Shimomura *et al.* does teach control of technical systems, including robotic systems (see [0017], robot) used by the system for generating commands (see [0090], speech synthesizer outputs speech based on conversation) for the technical systems (see Figure 20, all steps and [0010], [0011], and [0082] it is realized by the topic manager whether the topic of the conversation has changed in order to best communicate with the user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the language processing as taught by Roushar using it in conjunction with robots as taught by Shimomura for the purpose of carrying out dialogue with a user (see Shimomura, [0002]) using the interpretation results as taught by Roushar.

16. Claims 32 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roushar in view of Stieler (US 6,044,322).

As to claim 32 and 44, Roushar teaches all of the limitations as in claims 28 and 38, above.

However, Roushar does not specifically teach the use of the system in a taxiway control for airports.

Stieler teaches the use of speech in taxiway control for airports (see col. 2, lines 15-27, traffic objects can be identified and output).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the language processing as taught by Roushar using it in conjunction with taxiways as taught by Stieler for the purpose of traffic monitoring (see Stieler col. 1, lines 5-7).

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 55 and 57-69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior art either alone or in combination teach the limitations in combination with the independent claims from which they are based, "the conflict module transmits a request code to the artificial language intelligence ...said comparison routine determined by the combination of information contained in the request code... extracts information from the situation module ... transmits the cognitive comparison routine and the information extracted from the situation module to the conflict module; the conflict module compares ...said linguistically provided information with said information extracted from the situation module...." as recited in claim 55 and

the limitations of "risk analysis by an expertise module, ... the expertise module compares the reconstructed meaning ... with expert knowledge contained in a expert knowledge module... by using an appropriate routine" as recited in claim 58.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Harris (US 6,604,094) is cited to disclose simulation of human intelligence using natural language dialog. Visel (Us 7,098,218) is cited to disclose emulation of human brain.

The NPL document by Zickus ("A Software Engineering Approach to Developing an object-oriented Lexical Access Database and Semantic Reasoning Module") is cited to disclose incorporation of multiple databases for systems that are syntactic, semantic, and lexical knowledge dependent. Asher et al. ("lexical Disambiguation in a Discourse Context") is cited to disclose the effect of discourse structure on meanings. Porzel ("Contextual Coherence in Natural Language Processing" is cited to disclose inclusion of contextual knowledge for improving spoken dialog systems".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PARAS SHAH whose telephone number is (571)270-1650. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-THURS. 7:30a.m.-4:00p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571)272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Paras Shah/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

11/02/2009